Remarks

Claims 1-31 are pending in the application and stand rejected. Claims 1, 14, 18 and 31 have been amended. New claims 32 and 33 have been added to the application. As an initial matter, the Examiner's attention is directed to the Change of Correspondence Address ("COCA") submitted to the PTO on February 15, 2006. The Examiner is respectfully requested to direct all future correspondence concerning this application to the undersigned at the address listed in the COCA and below. The claim amendments should in no way be construed to be acquiescence to any rejection based on alleged prior art. The amendments to the claims are made solely to clarify the nature of certain limitations and to thus expedite the prosecution of the application. Accordingly, none of the claim amendments narrow the claims as originally presented. Applicant reserves the option to further prosecute the same or similar claims in the instant or subsequent patent applications.

Objection to Claim 31

Claim 31 has been amended and is now believed to be in condition for allowance. As such, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this objection.

Rejection of Claims 1-18, 20-29 and 31 Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) As Being Anticipated By Saulpaugh

Claim 1

Claim 1 as amended recites a method for a mobile agent object to discover services available in a host-computing environment. The mobile agent object is operable to execute in a first electronic device, halt execution in the first electronic device at an execution state, be transplanted to a second electronic device, and resume execution from the execution state in the second electronic device.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to FIG. 3 and paragraphs 27-31, a mobile agent object may discover the services available in a host-computing environment by requesting and receiving a service listing from the directory service object 205 at blocks 303 and 306. The mobile agent then checks the service listing for a desired service at block 310, and if the service is available, the mobile agent requests the service at block 316.

In contrast, Saulpaugh fails in any manner to teach or suggest a method for a mobile agent object to discover services available in a host-computing environment. In no manner does Saulpaugh teach that the client referenced by the Examiner is operable to execute in a first electronic device, halt execution in the first electronic device at an execution state, be transplanted to a second electronic device, and resume execution from the execution state in the second electronic device. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw this rejection.

Claims 14, 18, and 31

Claims 14, 18 and 31 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 1.

Claim 8

Claim 8 recites an audit system detecting a request for a service by a mobile agent object, the audit system generating an audit event in response to detecting the request, and the audit system logging the audit event in a database.

For example, referring, *e.g.*, to FIGS. 2 and 4 and paragraphs 26 and 33 of the application, an auditing subsystem 220 provides an API 221 for logging audit events into an audit database 230. The auditing subsystem 220 also provides various auditing plugins 225 access to the data in the audit database 230 as well as a notification system with which auditing plugins 225 can be

- 11 -

notified of events in the auditing subsystem 220. The audit database 230 stores auditing event entries. Each of the plurality of auditing plugins 225 is operable to interact with the API 221 provided by the auditing subsystem 220.

When an object is requested within either a service object 207 or the directory service object 205 by a mobile agent object, the requested object generates auditing events and uses the auditing subsystem 220 to keep track of requested objects. As such, when an object is requested, an API 221 corresponding to the auditing subsystem 220 starts the event process. The auditing subsystem 221 then logs the event into the audit database 230. Additionally, the auditing subsystem 221 sends a notification event to each of the auditing plugins 225. The auditing plugins 225 may then use the API 221 of the auditing subsystem 221 to access the new data now stored in the audit database 230.

In contrast, and as cited by the Examiner, Saulpaugh, at col. 27, lines 8-18, teaches message gates that may be configured to perform resource monitoring. For example, since all messages may flow through a gate, the gate may be configured to manage and/or track a client's use of a service (and possibly its associated resources such as memory or threads). A gate may be configured to track the activity of a software program, such as a client, by monitoring how much a resource, such as a service, is used or which and how many service resources are used. In one embodiment, a gate may generate or may facilitate generation of a client activity log. Each message and its destination or sender may be logged. Saulpaugh fails to teach or suggest detection of a request for a service, generation of audit events in response to request detection, or a database in which audit events are logged.

Claim 24

Claim 24 is patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above with reference to Claim 8.

Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20-23, and 25-29

Claims 2-7, 9-13, 15-17, 20-23, and 25-29 are patentable by virtue of their respective dependencies from claims 1, 8, 14, 18, and 24.

Rejection of Claims 19 and 30 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) As Being Unpatentable Over Saulpaugh In View of Admitted Prior Art

Claim 19

The admitted prior art fails to supply the teachings missing from Saulpaugh, as described with reference to claim 18 above. Thus, claim 19 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 18.

Claim 30

The admitted prior art fails to supply the teachings missing from Saulpaugh, as described with reference to claim 24 above. Thus, claim 30 is patentable by virtue of its dependency from claim 24.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Applicant requests a finding of allowability for all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned. **If the Examiner does not agree with the Applicant's position that all pending claims are allowable, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned to arrange a telephonic discussion of the claims prior to issuing an Office Action.**

Respectfully submitted,

BLACK LOWE & GRAHAM PLLC

P. G. Scott Born
Registration No. 40,523
701 Fifth Avenue, Suite 4800
Seattle, WA 98104
Direct Dial: 206.957.2491